

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 4 are amended and claims 2-3 and 6 are cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 are pending in this application. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0038904 to Kaneko et al. (Kaneko) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,138 to Ha et al. (Ha). The Office Action rejects claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaneko and Ha and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,637 to Yoon et al. (Yoon). The Office Action rejects claims 2, 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kaneko and Ha and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,952 to Okamoto et al. (Okamoto). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

By this Amendment, claims 2-3 and 6 are cancelled. Thus the rejections of these claims are moot.

Claim 1 is allowable because Kaneko in view of Ha fails to disclose a reflective layer having a portion directly below a switching element shielding the alignment disorder of the liquid crystal layer from being viewed during transmissive display.

The Office Action admits that Kaneko fails to disclose these features. Ha fails to cure the deficiencies. Ha discloses reflecting layer 181 which, as admitted by the Office Action, is above thin film transistor T. While Ha discloses the extension of reflecting layer 181 over the thin film transistor T and that the black matrix 320 can be removed, the reflecting layer 181 must be kept above the thin film transistor T as a light shielding layer. Further, while Ha discloses reflecting layer 181 above thin film transistor T, the reflecting layer 181 does not cover contact holes 171 and 191 and, thus, does not shield the alignment disorder of the liquid crystal layer 350, which occurs at contact holes 171 and 191, from being viewed.

For the foregoing reasons, Kaneko and Ha do not disclose the combination of features recited in claim 1. Likewise, dependent claims 4, 5 and 7 are patentable because claim 1 is patentable.

Nevertheless, in order to further clarify that claim 1 distinguishes over the applied references, claim 1 is amended to recite the feature that at least one of a slit, opening and ridge overlaps, in plan view, with both the slope of the adjusting layer and the edge of the reflective layer.

None of the applied references discloses this feature. For example, Yoon, cited by the Office Action as disclosing slit 150, does not disclose slit 150 in conjunction with any adjusting layer, let alone, overlapping a slope of such layer in plan view.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/tbm

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: July 13, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--